## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

The ESTATE OF SYLVILLE K. SMITH, by Personal Representative Mildred Haynes,	)	No. 17-cv-862
Patrick Smith, and Mildred Haynes, on her own behalf,	)	
,	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
v.	)	
CITY OF MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN	)	
and DOMINIQUE HEAGGAN-BROWN,	)	
Defendants.	)	

## EXHIBIT 40

State v. D. Heaggan-Brown Opening Statements

David B. Owens Danielle Hamilton LOEVY & LOEVY 311 N. Aberdeen St, Third FL Chicago, IL 60607 (312) 243-5900

1 2	STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT MILWAUKEE COUNTY BRANCH 30
3	STATE OF WISCONSIN,
5	Plaintiff,
6	vs. Case No. 2016-CF-005562
7	DOMINIQUE L. HEAGGAN-BROWN,
8	Defendant.
9	
	JURY TRIAL (PM)
10	
11	JUNE 13, 2017 HON. JEFFREY A. CONEN,
12	Circuit Court Judge, LAURELL L. BRESLOW-COLLIEN, RPR presiding.
13	Official Court Reporter
14	CHARGE:
15	Count 1: First-Degree Reckless Homicide
16	
17	
18	
19	APPEARANCES:
20	JOHN T. CHISHOLM, District Attorney, and BENJAMIN
21	LINDSAY, Assistant District Attorney, appeared on behalf of the State of Wisconsin.
22	STEVEN R. KOHN and JONATHAN C. SMITH, Attorneys at Law,
23	appeared on behalf of the Defendant.
24	DOMINIQUE L. HEAGGAN-BROWN, Defendant, was present in custody.
25	ALSO PRESENT: J. Michael Damarco, Investigator

1	<u>I N D E X</u>	
2	<u>P</u>	<u>AGE</u>
3	PRELIMINARIES	3
4	PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS	7
5	OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. CHISHOLM 1	L 8
6	OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. SMITH 3	39
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS (1:33 p.m.)

THE CLERK: Case No. 16-CF-5562, State of Wisconsin vs. Dominique Heaggan-Brown, first-degree reckless homicide. Matter is here for a jury trial. Appearances.

2.0

2.2

2.3

MR. CHISHOLM: John Chisholm on behalf of the State. Assisting me is Assistant DA Ben Lindsay.

MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Attorneys Jonathan Smith and Steven Kohn on behalf of Mr. Heaggan-Brown who is present.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. We're going to this afternoon start with the preliminary instructions. I've provided the parties with the preliminary instructions that the Court intends to give, which will be No. 50, which is preliminary instruction on juror conduct, evidence, 103; 148, objections of counsel; 55, note taking permitted; 58, transcript not available for deliberations; 59, police reports; 300, credibility of witnesses; 120, first-degree reckless homicide with the 805 modified instruction that we had talked about before involving the self-defense issue and privilege issue in this case; 140, burden of proof and

1 presumption of innocence; and 101, opening 2 statements. 3 Any objection to those from the State? 4 MR. CHISHOLM: No, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: And from the defense, subject to whatever objections you have made on 6 7 the record at this point, are there any objections to anything else that I've mentioned subject to 8 9 the objection with regard to 805? 10 MR. SMITH: No, sir. 11 THE COURT: All right. So the Court 12 will start with the preliminary instructions, and we will then move along to the opening statements. 13 14 We'll break for the evening. And for continuity 15 sake, we'll start tomorrow morning at 9:00 and 16 work our way all the way through with evidence all 17 day tomorrow, and we should be on track, based on 18 what I've been told, to finish up the State's case 19 somewhere around middle of the day on Thursday, I 2.0 hope. 2.1 Mr. Chisholm, somewhere around there? 2.2. MR. CHISHOLM: I believe so. 2.3 THE COURT: Give or take a little bit, 2.4 and then the defense case can start either 25 Thursday afternoon or Friday, and then we'll move

1	into Monday and Tuesday. So that's the hope right
2	now, and we'll stay on track. We do have
3	uninterrupted time. There is no other cases on
4	the Court's calendar for the next week and a half
5	so everything is dedicated to this case.
6	Having said that, as soon as the jurors
7	are available, we will bring them in.
8	(An off-the-record discussion was held
9	between the Court and the bailiff.)
10	THE COURT: We are just waiting for the
11	jury to get situated back there and get together
12	and be brought out into the courtroom. After
13	that, the jury will be sworn and then we'll start
14	with the preliminary instructions.
15	THE BAILIFF: All rise for the jury.
16	(The jury entered the courtroom.)
17	THE BAILIFF: You may be seated.
18	THE COURT: Jurors remain standing for
19	an oath.
20	THE CLERK: Can you all raise your
21	right hands?
22	(The jury was sworn in.)
23	THE COURT: All right. You may be
24	seated. All right. Good afternoon, ladies and
25	gentlemen. Hopefully everything went well in the

transition and we'll have further transition later this evening. We are down to 15 jurors. We have lost a juror. You are not to speculate as to the reason, but we are ready to proceed with the 15 that we have so that there will be 12 and three alternates.

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

We are going to start with the preliminary instructions. Listen carefully to the preliminary instructions. Preliminary instructions are an overview of the law which you are to follow in eventually making your decision in this case. There are only a handful of the instructions that will eventually be given to you at the end of the trial. So they allow you to listen to the testimony and see the evidence in some framework or reference involving the law.

You do not have to memorize these instructions. At the end of the case, when we give you the final instructions, you'll be given a written copy of the final instructions to take with you in the jury room to use during your deliberations. So just listen carefully to the instructions. We will then follow up with additional — with the argument — I'm sorry, opening statements of the attorneys, and then we

will break for the evening and start up tomorrow morning at 9:00 and work through the evidence.

We are still on track to make it through my schedule as we've talked about beforehand. This is timed out pretty well so we're still working on keeping on track within the time schedule and the timeframe of this case.

Before the trial begins, there are certain instructions you should have to better understand your functions as a juror and how you should conduct yourself during the trial.

Your duty is to decide the case based only on the evidence presented and the law given to you by the Court. Anything that you may see or hear outside the courtroom is not evidence. Do not let any personal feelings about race, religion, national origin, sex, or age affect your consideration of the evidence.

Do not begin your deliberations and discussion of the case until all the evidence is presented and I have instructed you on the law.

Do not discuss this case among yourselves or with anyone else until your final deliberations in the jury room.

We will stop or recess from time to

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.3

2.4

time during the trial. You may be excused from the courtroom when it is necessary for me to hear legal arguments from the lawyers. If you come in contact with the parties, lawyers, or witnesses, do not speak with them. For their part, the parties, lawyers, and witnesses will not contact or speak with the jurors. Do not listen to any conversation about this case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.3

2.4

25

Do not research any information that you personally think might be helpful to you in understanding the issues presented. Do not investigate this case on your own or visit the Do not read any newspaper reports or listen to any news reports on radio or television about this trial. Do not consult dictionaries, computers, websites, or other reference materials for additional information. Do not seek information regarding the public records of any party or witness in this case. Any information you obtain outside the courtroom could be misleading, inaccurate, or incomplete. Relying on this information is unfair because the parties would not have the opportunity to refute, explain, or correct it.

Do not communicate with anyone about

2.4

this trial or your experience as a juror while you are serving on this jury. Do not use a computer, cell phone, or other electronic device with communication capabilities to share any information about this case. For example, do not communicate by blog, e-mail, text message,

Twitter, or in any other way on or off the computer. Do not communicate with anyone -
Strike that.

Do not permit anyone to communicate with you, and if anyone does so despite you're telling them not to, you should report that to me. This case must be decided by you, the jurors, based on the evidence presented in the courtroom. People not serving on this jury have not heard the evidence, and it is improper for them to influence your deliberations and decision in this case.

After this trial is completed, you are free to communicate with anyone in any manner.

These rules are intended to assure that the jurors remain impartial throughout the trial. If any juror has reason to believe that another juror has violated these rules, you should report that to me. If jurors do not comply with these rules, it could result in a new trial involving

additional time and significant expense to the parties and taxpayers.

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.3

2.4

You are to decide the case solely on the evidence offered and received at trial.

Evidence is: First, the sworn testimony of witnesses, both on direct and cross-examination, regardless of who called the witnesses; second, the exhibits the Court has received, whether or not an exhibit goes to the jury room; and third, any facts to which the lawyers have agreed or stipulated or which the Court has directed you to find.

Attorneys for each side have the right and the duty to object to what they consider are improper questions asked of witnesses and to the admission of other evidence which they believe is not properly admissible. You should not draw any conclusion from the fact that an objection was made.

By allowing testimony or other evidence to be received over the objection of counsel, the Court is not indicating any opinion about the evidence. You jurors are the judges of the credibility of the witnesses and of the weight of the evidence.

You are not required to but you may take notes during this trial except during opening statements and closing arguments. The Court will provide you with materials.

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

In taking notes, you must be careful that it does not distract you from listening -- or from carefully listening to and observing the witnesses.

You may rely on your notes to refresh your memory -- or you may rely on your notes to refresh your memory during the deliberations.

Otherwise, keep them confidential. After the trial, the notes will be collected and destroyed.

You will not have a copy of the written transcript of the trial testimony available for use during your deliberations. You should pay careful attention to all the testimony because you must rely primarily on your memory of the evidence and the testimony introduced during the trial.

During the course of the trial, the attorneys may refer to or use police reports with witnesses. Normally, these police reports will not be provided to you. If you are not provided with a police report, you should use your collective memory regarding any reference to

police reports.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

It is the duty of the jury to scrutinize and to weigh the testimony of the witnesses and to determine the effect of the evidence as a whole. You are the sole judges of the credibility, that is, the believability of the witnesses and of the weight to be given to their testimony.

In determining the credibility of each witness and the weight you give to the testimony of each witness, consider these factors: Whether the witness has an interest or lack of interest in the result of this trial; the witness's conduct, appearance, and demeanor on the witness stand; the clearness or lack of clearness of the witness's recollections; the opportunity the witness had for observing and for knowing the matters the witness testified about; the reasonableness of the witness's testimony; the apparent intelligence of the witness; bias or prejudice, if any has been shown; possible motives for falsifying testimony; and all other facts and circumstances during the trial which tend either to support or discredit the testimony. Then give to the testimony of each witness the weight you believe it should receive.

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

There is no magic way for you to evaluate the testimony; instead, you should use your common sense and experience. In everyday life, you determine for yourselves the reliability of things people say to you. You must do the same -- or you should do the same thing here.

First-degree reckless homicide, as defined in Section 940.02(1) of the Criminal Code of Wisconsin, is committed by one who recklessly causes the death of another human being under circumstances that showed utter disregard for human life.

Before you may find the defendant guilty of first-degree reckless homicide, the State must prove by evidence which satisfies you beyond a reasonable doubt that the following three elements were present. First, that the defendant caused the death of Sylville Smith. "Cause" means the defendant's act was a substantial factor in producing the death.

Second, that the defendant caused the death by criminally reckless conduct. "Criminally reckless conduct" means the conduct created a risk of death or great bodily harm to another person; and the risk of death or great bodily harm was

unreasonable and substantial; and the defendant was aware that his conduct created the unreasonable and substantial risk of death or great bodily harm.

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

Third, that the circumstances of the defendant's conduct showed utter disregard for human life.

In determining whether the circumstances of the conduct showed utter disregard for human life, consider these factors: Whether -- what the witness -- strike that, what the defendant was doing; why the defendant was engaged in that conduct; how dangerous the conduct was; how obvious the danger was; whether the conduct showed any regard for life; and all other facts and circumstances relating to the conduct.

Self-defense is an issue in this case. The law of self-defense allows the defendant to intentionally use force against another only if:

The defendant believed that there was an actual or imminent unlawful interference with the defendant's person or the person of Officer Ndiva Malafa; and that the defendant believed that the amount of force the defendant used was necessary to prevent or terminate the interference; and the

defendant's beliefs were reasonable.

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.3

2.4

The defendant may intentionally use force which is intended or likely to cause death or great bodily harm only if the defendant reasonably believed that the force used was necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm to himself or Officer Malafa.

A reasonable -- strike that. A belief may be reasonable even though mistaken. In determining whether the defendant's beliefs were reasonable, the standard is what an ordinary, prudent, and reasonably intelligent police officer would have believed in the defendant's position, having knowledge and training that the defendant possessed, and acting under the circumstances that existed at the time of the alleged offense.

A "police officer" means any person employed by the City of Milwaukee for the purpose of detecting and preventing crime and enforcing laws or ordinances and who is authorized to make arrests for violations of laws or ordinances.

The reasonableness of the defendant's beliefs must be determined from the standpoint of the defendant at the time of the defendant's acts and not from the viewpoint of the jury now.

The State must prove by evidence which satisfies you beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did not act lawfully in self-defense.

If you can -- strike that. If you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that all three elements of first-degree reckless homicide have been proved and the defendant did not act lawfully in self-defense, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you are not so satisfied, you must find the defendant not guilty.

In reaching your verdict, examine the evidence with care and caution. Act with judgment, reason, and prudence.

Defendants are not required to prove their innocence. The law presumes every person charged with the commission of an offense to be innocent. This presumption requires a finding of not guilty unless in your deliberations you find it is overcome by evidence which satisfies you beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty.

The burden of establishing every fact necessary to constitute guilt is upon the State. Before you can return a verdict of guilty, the

evidence must satisfy you beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is quilty.

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.3

2.4

If you can reconcile the evidence upon any reasonable hypothesis consistent with the defendant's innocence, you should do so and return a verdict of not guilty.

The term "reasonable doubt" means a doubt based upon reason and common sense. It is a doubt for which a reason can be given, arising from a fair and rational consideration of the evidence or lack of evidence. It means such a doubt as would cause a person of ordinary prudence to pause or to hesitate when called upon to act in the most important affairs of life.

A reasonable doubt is not a doubt which is based upon mere guesswork or speculation. A doubt which arises merely from sympathy or from fear to return a verdict of guilt is not a reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt is not a doubt such as may be used to escape the responsibility of a decision.

While it is your duty to give the defendant the benefit of every reasonable doubt, you are not to search for doubt. You are to search for the truth.

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

The lawyers will now make opening statements. The purpose of an opening statement is to give the lawyers an opportunity to tell you what they expect the evidence will show so that you will better understand the evidence as it is introduced during the trial. I must caution you, however, that opening statements are not evidence.

Mr. Chisholm.

MR. CHISHOLM: Thank you very much,
Your Honor, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen.
I'm going to take you back to August 13th of 2016.
On August 13 of 2016, Mr. Heaggan-Brown, while
working as a City of Milwaukee police officer,
shot Sylville Smith two times. He shot him twice.
The first shot went through his right bicep,
through-and-through; the second shot entered his
chest. That second shot killed Sylville Smith.

Now, when I take you back to that time, it's really important that you understand the location, the orientation, and what was taking place on August 13th. So if I take you back to about 3:30 on August 13th, that's a Saturday. It's in the summer, it's about 80 degrees that day, you know, mostly cloudy but clear, and I'm going to take you to the location of the 3200

1	block of North 44th Street. I'm going to show you
2	a diagram because, again, it is important it's
3	important
4	MR. SMITH: Your Honor.
5	MR. CHISHOLM: that you get the
6	opportunity.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Chisholm.
8	MR. SMITH: Can I just see?
9	MR. CHISHOLM: Oh, I'm sorry.
10	THE COURT: Are you able to see it as
11	it's being pointed to?
12	MR. SMITH: No.
13	MR. CHISHOLM: Can I move it more
14	towards you?
15	MR. SMITH: I'll move to this side of
16	the table. Thank you.
17	MR. CHISHOLM: Can everyone still see
18	that? It's really important in this case that you
19	have an understanding of the context; the location
20	that this was taking place.
21	So I'm taking you back now August 13th,
22	2016. What you're looking at is a diagram. Now,
23	this diagram is basically laid out so that you can
24	see that this is north 44th Street going north and
25	south.

2.0

2.3

The location that we're talking about is a gangway, the location between 3216-3218, that's a duplex; and 3210-3212 North 44th Street, another duplex. Almost this entire incident occurred in a relatively small geographic area. So it starts right on North 44th Street and it ends about two or three houses north of -- north of Auer, right in that location right there.

Now, the reason I want you to be oriented there, and I think it's sometimes helpful just to be able to picture what's taken place. You'll get an opportunity to see the evidence itself. The most essential evidence you're going to see is going to come from the police officers themselves that were involved in this incident on that day, and the form of that evidence is going to come from body cameras. You're going to see body cameras from Mr. Heaggan-Brown, you're going to see a body camera from Officer Ndiva Malafa, and there was a third officer involved in this as well, Officer Voden. He did not have a body camera that day.

So when I take you back to that location, I can tell you what the evidence will show is that on that day right around 3:30, 3:35

in the afternoon, those three officers, Officer
Heaggan-Brown, Officer Voden, and Officer Malafa,
they were in two separate cars. Officer
Heaggan-Brown was driving a Tahoe, SUV-type
vehicle. He was by himself. In an unmarked
police squad right behind him were officers Malafa
and Voden. Officer Malafa is the driver. Officer
Voden's the passenger. Officer Heaggan-Brown is
the sole occupant of the SUV, but he's also the
driver. Makes sense.

What happens is they're on routine patrol, and they decide to go into this area, right -- you want to picture it -- it's about a couple blocks northwest of Sherman Park, right in that area right there. They're in this location when they see a 2016 Ford Fusion black car that you see in this diagram right there. They later determine that that's Sylville Smith's car. With him at the time is a gentleman by the name of Demario Pritchard (phonetic).

What is described by the officers, and what the evidence shows, is that Officer

Heaggan-Brown pulls his car up next to Sylville

Smith, and Officer Malafa pulls his car up

directly behind Sylville Smith's car. They

indicate that they're seeing activity that makes
them suspicious. They observe that this vehicle
is parked more than 12 inches from the curb.

Because of that, they decide to conduct a stop.

At that point in time, it's important

2.0

2.3

At that point in time, it's important that you know that Officer Heaggan-Brown has positioned his car slightly to the north of Sylville Smith's car, and then Officer Malafa is directly behind him. This is where the body cameras kick in. This is where we start to capture the incident as it actually unfolded.

What you will observe from

Mr. Heaggan-Brown's body camera is you will see
him as he pulls up, you'll see him get out of his
car, and you will see that he immediately pulls
his gun out and points it in a westerly direction.

Now, when I give you these directions, again, getting oriented is sometimes really important. So just so you know, you're looking at me, you're looking to the west. This is to the north, this is to the east, and that's south. I'm telling you that just to orient you in the courtroom itself, but on this diagram you have to understand that this is north, this is east, and this is west, and this is south (indicating).

What you'll see from Heaggan-Brown's camera is that he gets out of his car and he goes to the front of his squad car, and that's the first time you're going to see him deploy his weapon. In other words, you'll actually see him pull the weapon out, and you'll see him pointing it towards the east. At that point in time on his camera, you're also going to see Officer Voden is encountering the gentleman later determined to be Mr. Pritchard who had been observed right next to Mr. Smith's car. He's actually walked back toward the sidewalk, and you'll see — just for a brief second you're going to see Officer Voden running to approach Mr. Pritchard.

At that point in time, you're going to see Sylville Smith, who is at -- by this time he's actually gotten out of his car and he starts running to the north. He's running to the north, and that's when he actually intersects with Heaggan-Brown, right at that point in time. He continues running to the north, he takes off north; you will then see Officer Heaggan-Brown starts in pursuit of Mr. Smith. Pursues him to the north, at which time you can observe that Mr. Sylville Smith takes a hard right to the east,

he goes into this gangway.

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.3

2.4

Just so you know, we'll measure this out so you understand sort of the dynamics of what you're dealing with, the actual layout itself, but you're talking about 15 feet between the two houses here. Very standard layout in the city of Milwaukee duplex area, right?

So you have a sidewalk. You'll learn from the evidence that there's actually a fence right across between these two houses right here; there's a chain link fence right here. What you're going to observe from Mr. Heaggan-Brown's body camera is that he begins in pursuit. So he actually puts his weapon back towards his holster. It's to hard determine whether he ever actually fully holsters it or not, but he puts it back towards his holster and he starts running to the north after Sylville Smith.

The second piece of evidence that you're going to see is coming from Officer Malafa. Officer Malafa, his body camera also activates almost at the same time as he stops his car behind Sylville Smith's car. Now, it's important that you know that the way these body cameras work — and this is evidence that will come in as well —

is that they don't start recording until a button is pressed, but they constantly record, they just don't save it until the button is pressed.

And so what you will get -- and it automatically will back up about 30 seconds. So if an officer is engaged in something that they believe should be recorded, they can hit that and it backs it up 30 seconds. And so we'll explain that.

But what you're seeing from those video cameras, it really starts right from the moment Officer Malafa pulls up right here and Officer Heaggan-Brown is pulling up right there. You can see the initial seconds of the encounter right from that moment there.

Now, from Officer Malafa's perspective from his body camera -- and again, these are details that I will present through the evidence of witnesses we'll present for you -- but those body cameras, the recording unit is located right around the chest area. The actual camera is located up here on the right shoulder by the lapel. So that's the perspective that you're getting from that camera right there.

What you're going to observe from

2.0

2.3

Officer Malafa is he actually -- you can actually see Mr. Smith getting out of his car and starting to run north right there. Now, you also will see, in video footage, you will capture at the same time, there's an intersection between Officer Heaggan-Brown and Officer Malafa, so you can actually see Officer Heaggan-Brown as he's pointing his weapon at -- in the easterly direction as Sylville Smith is running to the north. You're going to actually be able to see that.

Officer Malafa follows right behind
Officer Heaggan-Brown. So what now you have,
you're going to have two body cameras that are
essentially capturing the same event in roughly
the same time, basically taking place at the same
moment. You're going to see Officer Heaggan-Brown
is the first one in pursuit directly behind
Sylville Smith, and then you have Officer Malafa
right behind him.

Now, what you're going to see depicted is Sylville Smith, as he runs, he starts taking a hard right towards the east; you're going to see his hands go into the air, and you're going to see him basically wipe out. He wipes out right here,

right before this fence, right on the sidewalk.

2.0

2.3

He has a pistol. In fact, Officer

Malafa has actually seen that pistol from the

minute he started getting out of his car. Officer

Malafa will testify that he saw the pistol, and he

was on his radio calling that out. So as Officer

Malafa is chasing Mr. Smith, he's aware that he

has a pistol.

Officer Heaggan-Brown is not initially aware that he's got the pistol. He becomes aware of that after he's taking the curve after

Mr. Smith has already fallen to the ground, and what you'll see on the video footage is that the gun actually comes out of Sylville Smith's hand.

As he wipes out, he goes on the ground; that gun hits the ground.

These are now the critical moments.

These are absolutely the critical moments. At this moment what you will capture on — to some extent on both cameras, but certainly with

Mr. Heaggan-Brown's, is you will see Sylville

Smith holding onto that fence, just as I am if this were the fence right here, if I'm facing east holding onto that fence, reaching back for the firearm, reaching back for the firearm at that

point in time.

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.3

2.4

Mr. Heaggan-Brown at first looks like he might be going for his taser, and then he switches back to his gun and he draws his gun out at that point in time. When he sees Mr. Smith with his hand towards the ground and start lifting up, at that moment in time you can see an actual discharge from Officer Heaggan-Brown's firearm.

That's the first shot. That is the first shot, and we later determine that that's the shot that goes through Mr. Smith's bicep. It's a through-and-through wound. You'll hear testimony from the medical examiner that's not a fatal wound. It's a through-and-through shot at that point in time.

What you will then be able to determine from that body camera footage is a reasonable interpretation of what Mr. Smith was doing. A reasonable interpretation of what Mr. Smith was doing. What was he doing? He was throwing the gun over the fence. That's what the evidence is going to show, is he's picking that up, he's going to throw it over the fence; and, in fact, he disarms himself by throwing the gun about 30 feet over the fence.

He then immediately, after having been shot in the arm -- and keep in mind, nobody -- I hope nobody's ever had the experience of being shot. But the testimony will come in here as well is these aren't just ordinary weapons that are used, and most importantly it's not ordinary ammunition that's used by the police.

The ammunition that's used by the police is designed to do one thing and one thing only and that is to stop you. It's not like in the military. In the military, they're required by the Geneva Convention -- I won't get into that.

The bottom line, what the evidence is going to show is that the firearms and the bullets that are used by the Milwaukee Police Department and all law enforcement agencies are designed to do one thing, and that's to stop, and that's how they're designed.

That first round strikes Sylville Smith as he's throwing that gun over the fence, and at that point in time you'll see on the body camera Sylville Smith goes to the ground. As he's going to the ground, he hits the ground fully; he actually falls on his back, his feet come up, and his hands are then up by his head, a full 1.69

seconds after the first shot.

2.0

2.3

Heaggan-Brown tracking — tracking Sylville Smith down to the ground, and then when you switch over to Malafa's view, which will be the better one, you will actually see Heaggan-Brown standing directly over Sylville Smith about two feet away and 1.67 seconds after — 69 seconds after the first shot, you're going to see the second shot. You're going to see that second shot when Sylville Smith is on the ground, unarmed with his hands up by his head with no place to go. He's basically in this corner right here. He's going to have — he's going to have a brick wall to the north; he's got a fence to the east, he's got two police officers within feet of him at the time he's shot.

That second shot, the evidence is going to show, is from essentially within feet, point blank range it strikes him directly in the chest while he's laying on the ground, enters his body, damages his lungs, damages his heart, and ultimately ends up in his lower back. That is the fatal wound 1.69 seconds after he was shot in the arm and had thrown the gun over the fence.

We're going to continue to hear some of

the evidence both from those body cameras and then certainly from witnesses because the State has an obligation to investigate these cases very closely. The investigative agency in this case, the majority of the witnesses you're going to hear from come from the Wisconsin Department of Justice and the Division of Criminal Investigation. Why is that? Wisconsin laws require that an independent agency conduct police-related shootings. Why is it? It's a measure of accountability. It's a measure of independence.

We want somebody to come in that is not from the same department to conduct this investigation so they just get the facts. They get the facts, and they allow those facts to be presented in an objective way. And that's what you're going to hear from these witnesses, is just the objective facts. They're going to tell you what they saw, what they recovered.

The short outline of that, I anticipate starting early tomorrow morning, we'll start with what I will call a scene officer, that's Special Agent Martinez; he was the person responsible for actually collecting all the evidence on the scene.

After that I anticipate you're going to

hear from Officer Malafa himself, and after that you're going to have a series of witnesses; some of the witnesses will tell you what kind of evidence they collected, how they collected it, what was done with that evidence.

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

Eventually you're going to also hear then from Special Agent Raymond Gibbs, and he's an essential witness as well. Why? Why is he the essential witness? Well, what I've just described: First shot, second shot. You're saying to yourself, 1.69 seconds, boy, it seems like a short time. Here's what the law requires: The law requires that you only use force when you're faced with an imminent threat of death or great bodily harm. That's what the law requires, right?

So when we're looking at this, we have to assess that decision to fire that second round. That is ultimately what this case comes down to:

Was that second round a justified, appropriate, privileged, self-defensive shot? Was it reasonable for a person to have believed that they faced death or great bodily harm under those circumstances? That's the case.

And why I talked about Special Agent

Ray Gibbs, because we talked to Mr. Heaggan-Brown; he was given an opportunity to explain why he did what he did. And let's make it perfectly clear:

Officer Heaggan-Brown is not being charged for that first shot, even though objectively —

objectively you can make a reasonable interpretation that the only purpose that

Mr. Smith was reaching for that gun was to throw it away, that's not the standard that we apply.

The standard we apply is would it be reasonable for any person, but certainly would it be reasonable for a police officer with his training and experience, his understanding, his knowledge of the law and past experience to believe that under those circumstances he may have been confronted in a split second with a risk of death or great bodily harm to him or his partner. He's not being charged with that.

what he is being charged with is based on both his actions and his statement. His statement is made on August 15th, two days after the shooting. He's had an opportunity to reflect on this, to think about it. It's not like he was just pulled in right away and ordered to make a statement or anything like that.

He was given an opportunity to think about it. He was able to consult, and then he sat down with the agents and gave a statement. What his statement does is it basically gives that same version of events up to the first shot. Up to that first shot it's essentially the same thing.

What about the second shot? How does he explain the second shot? Well, what he says is that after the first shot was fired he sees that Mr. Smith had thrown the gun away. He tossed it. You're going to hear him say in the video four or five times shortly after that he tossed it, he tossed it. So he had the knowledge at that point in time that Sylville Smith was no longer armed.

He goes to the ground, and what does he give as the reason for shooting him the second time? He said that he thinks his hands were going to his waist and that he might have a second gun, that he would then draw that second gun and possibly use that to shoot him or Officer Malafa.

That statement the State will provide evidence is not reasonable with all the facts and circumstances in this case that a person doesn't throw a gun -- because the particular gun that Mr. Smith had was a Glock 20 -- Glock 22. It had

an extended magazine. Why would a person throw a qun away only to reach for another one?

2.0

2.2.

2.3

The evidence is going to show that that wasn't the reason because from the videotapes of the officers' body cameras themselves, Sylville Smith doesn't go for his waistband. In fact, he doesn't go -- I take that back, he does go for his waistband, but he doesn't go for his waistband until about nine seconds after he's been shot the second time. The first time he goes for his waistband is about nine seconds after he's been shot the second time. And what does Officer Heaggan-Brown do? He actually walks up to him and pushes his hand away.

So if he reasonably believes that

Sylville Smith is armed at that time, well,

according to his statement he should have feared

for his safety and he should have shot him then,

but that's not what happened.

What happens is Sylville Smith goes to the ground, hands go up by his head, Heaggan-Brown stands right over him and he shoots him at point blank range when he doesn't have the gun in his hands. That's what the evidence is going to show you.

My obligation is to look at that evidence; your obligation is to look at that evidence and determine whether or not a crime has occurred.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

Now, if I can, I'm just going to briefly -- and I'll finish -- just run through the elements of this offense, first-degree reckless homicide. First-degree reckless homicide, it has three elements. We try to break it into chunks, and the State has to prove each one of those chunks beyond a reasonable doubt.

So there's three elements that the Court has already instructed you and will instruct again. When it comes to first-degree reckless homicide, I call it the three Cs. It's an easy way to remember. The three Cs are simply this: You have to show the defendant caused -- he caused the death of Sylville Smith. Then we have to look at the conduct, that's the second C. The conduct created a risk of death or great bodily harm to another person, the risk of death or great bodily harm was unreasonable and substantial, and the defendant was aware that his conduct created the unreasonable and substantial risk of death or great bodily harm. And finally, care. Three Cs.

We'll say cause, conduct, and care.

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

What were his actions before and after that tell you as a jury in determining whether or not the circumstances of the conduct showed utter disregard for human life?

The State will present evidence that any time you shoot an unarmed man on the ground right in the chest causing his death, you're showing utter disregard for that person's life.

Some of this will be difficult -
difficult things to see. You're also going to see

that Sylville Smith was still breathing a full

minute, minute and a half after that shooting.

CPR didn't begin on Sylville Smith until a minute

and a half -- roughly over a minute after he was

shot in the chest. Those are things that you can

consider when looking at whether there was also

conduct consistent with utter disregard for life.

Now, we understand -- we understand that this is going to be a self-defense case. We embrace that, we acknowledge it, and we have to look at the issue of self-defense.

The issue always comes down to reasonableness. Anyone, any citizen, anybody is entitled to defend themselves. If you're at risk

2.4

for death or great bodily harm, you are entitled to defend yourself, but it has to be -- it has to be a reasonable and substantial threat. And under these circumstances, the State believes will show evidence that will show that just didn't exist at the time. I have to demonstrate that the defendant believed that there was an actual or imminent unlawful interference with the defendant's person or the person of Officer Malafa.

First shot, yes. In fact, we'll break them -- we'll break them both down. As we go forward, we'll break them both down. The facts support that in the first shot, yes. The defendant believed that the amount of force the defendant used was necessary to prevent or terminate the interference. The evidence is not going to support that. Mr. Heaggan-Brown's own statement does not support that. The defendant's belief --

MR. SMITH: Objection. Argumentative.

THE COURT: Rephrase the statement, or opening statement.

MR. CHISHOLM: Sure. I anticipate the evidence is going to show you that that does not

support that, the evidence doesn't support that.

And that the defendant's beliefs were reasonable.

Again, we'll look directly to the defendant's own statement to answer that question.

The defendant may intentionally use force which is intended or likely to cause death or great bodily harm, only if the defendant reasonably believed that the force used was necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm to himself. We're going to break it down.

We're going to look at both the first shot and second shot, and at the conclusion of all of this evidence, I am confident that you will have sufficient evidence to find Mr. Heaggan-Brown guilty of the offense of first-degree reckless homicide. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

Mr. Chisholm, good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. This is one of two times that we get to address you directly. Certainly very appreciative of your time. Everyone has thanked you, and we continue to do

so. Mr. Heaggan-Brown is appreciative. This is really an important part of the process. The jury system's really sort of the cornerstone of our criminal justice system, so again, we thank you for your time.

2.0

2.2

2.3

2.4

There are many things that Mr. Chisholm has said that the evidence is going to show that I don't disagree with. There are some very fundamental disagreements, however, as well. The scene diagram, as he has laid it out, I don't disagree that that's how the evidence is going to show.

The scene is what it is; it's the scene. But ultimately we believe that the evidence is going to show that Dominique Heaggan-Brown is not guilty of first-degree reckless homicide.

The judge has told you that opening statements are not evidence, and indeed, they are not. And they aren't argument. Opening statements are just that; it's a statement. We sometimes refer to it as a road map; what do we think that the evidence is going to show you. Of course, until we hear the evidence, no one knows for certain, but this is what we believe the

evidence is going to show.

2.0

2.3

And it is an opportunity, as the judge has indicated, to alert you to some matters. So as you're listening to testimony and observing evidence, there are some things that you may wish to -- well, I know you wish to pay attention to all of it, but just so you are aware of what is forthcoming.

This case is not to be decided on sympathy. The judge has told you that. It's to be decided on the law; that is proof beyond a reasonable doubt. That is why we're here. It's Mr. Chisholm's burden to do so.

And what we believe the evidence is going to show is, indeed, on August the 13th, Dominique Heaggan-Brown, Mr. Heaggan-Brown had been a City of Milwaukee police officer for approximately three years, a little over three years. He had previously attended the police academy where he received training in the investigative process, the law, police procedures, tactics, and significantly, the use of force including the use of deadly force. And he used that police training, the evidence will show, during those — and his experience during those

three-plus years, he used that on August the 13th of 2016.

2.0

2.3

Organizationally, the City of Milwaukee is broken into seven police districts, okay, and Mr. Heaggan-Brown was assigned to the 7th district. The 7th district includes an area called the Sherman Park neighborhood, Sherman Park area. Without question, as with a good portion of the city, there are a number of fine, decent, great-quality people who live in that area. But the evidence will show that area, as other areas of the city, also known to be what they call a high-crime area, be it drug trafficking, guns, other criminal activity, is known as a high-crime area.

On August 13th of last year,
Mr. Heaggan-Brown's normal shift, the shift that
he would normally work, would be 4 p.m. to
midnight; however, there was an initiative by the
department to show a greater police presence in
the area, sort of a show of force, what have you,
in this area, and Mr. Heaggan-Brown worked some
overtime.

As a matter of fact, I believe Officers

Malafa and Voden were similarly situated, normally

4 to midnight, agreed to work some overtime.

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.3

2.4

This overtime took place prior to the normal shift. It began at 2:00. The evidence will show Mr. Heaggan-Brown was normally assigned to the bicycle patrol during warmer weather and that he would patrol that area and many areas, but he was familiar with that neighborhood area.

They begin their patrol.

Mr. Heaggan-Brown is in his own vehicle or a vehicle assigned to him. Officers Voden and Malafa are in a separate vehicle; that during the course of those two hours they have some interaction with members of the public, and they're really working their way back towards the station because they are to begin their normal, regular shift. That overtime period is coming to a close.

A decision is made to go through a certain area, and when they do so, they observe a vehicle with out-of-state plates parked more than 12 inches from the curb.

You will learn, and the evidence will show you, that it is known to these officers and officers that it is not uncommon for individuals engaged in the trafficking of narcotics to use

newer vehicles, out-of-state plates in their pursuits. And also you'll learn parking more than 12 inches from the curb is an ordinance violation within the City of Milwaukee.

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.3

2.4

And such an infraction, in addition to other matters, but this infraction is something that law enforcement will use in order to engage or have interaction with individuals, particularly, if they want to conduct what we call a legal investigatory stop. And that's what was happening here.

Mr. Heaggan-Brown, Officers Malafa and Voden were conducting an investigatory stop, based upon their training and experience because of this vehicle, because of the out-of-state plates, because it was parked more than 12 inches from the curb, and because there was a person on the passenger side of said vehicle sort of leaning in or towards the vehicle as though some type of transaction took place. That's why they are trying to conduct this stop.

As soon as this investigatory stop
begins, before Mr. Heaggan-Brown can even exit his
vehicle, a man, later identified as Sylville
Smith, begins running. Sylville Smith was not

known to Dominique Heaggan-Brown. But he starts running, and when he runs, he has a gun in his hand. It's a gun with an extended clip or magazine. You'll hear testimony about that. And Officer Malafa advises he's got a gun.

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

Mr. Heaggan-Brown, Mr. Malafa, they give chase. Mr. Heaggan-Brown is ahead of Officer Malafa but trailing behind Mr. Smith. During that pursuit, Mr. Smith is being commanded by law enforcement, "Drop the gun, drop the gun," but he does not. He turns the corner, as this was talked about the evidence is going to show, and the body camera footage that has been referenced will show what appears as that Smith, while holding this weapon, either slips or runs into the fence or attempts to jump the fence or what have you, but he drops the gun.

The evidence will show he's still being commanded, "Drop the gun." Instead, Mr. Smith picks up that weapon, turns towards Officer Heaggan-Brown and Officer Malafa. First shot, through the right bicep, it's a through-and-through.

When the shot hits his arm, we believe the evidence will show it either causes him to

lose control of the gun or it is thrown over the fence by Smith. We believe the evidence in the video will show that he attempts to scale that fence, and as doing so, he falls backwards onto his back with his whole body going back, his hands, feet coming back, and then coming forward.

2.0

2.2

2.3

2.4

The video will show that it's not only his feet coming forward. It will show that his hands are coming forward, and it's at that time that the second shot is fired, the shot that hits him in the chest.

With his hands going forward fearing that he still may have had access to the first gun, fearing that he may be reaching for another gun, fearing for his safety and the safety of Officer Malafa, he fires that second shot. The time as is mentioned between that first and second shot is less than two seconds, 1.7, 1.69 seconds. These are literally split-second decisions that Dominique Heaggan-Brown is making and making under fast-moving circumstances.

You will also see on the video that even after that second shot is fired, Smith is being commanded, "Stop reaching, stop reaching, get your hands away." The weapons still trained

on him, still pointed at him when that is being said. The evidence will show that he's saying this because he believed that Smith could have access to that first weapon or, with the reaching, the second weapon at the waistband.

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

At some point while this is going on or as he falls, a swarm of bees are stirred up. At some point during this process, Officer

Heaggan-Brown is stung by a bee, though at that time he doesn't know if he's stung by a bee or if it's something else; gunpowder residue, what have you, something else, but he feels this burning sensation, and you're going to hear all of this in the tape.

But he and Officer Malafa pull
Mr. Smith away from where these bees are, and
Dominique Heaggan-Brown begins to perform chest
compressions on Mr. Smith, albeit a very short
time; he seems to come in contact with blood and
there's a question of whether he should have
gloves and whatnot. Ultimately another officer
takes over, and notwithstanding those efforts,
Mr. Smith dies.

Pursuant to protocol, Mr. Heaggan-Brown is sort of removed of the investigative scene

here. He's still on scene. You're going to
hear — what I think you will hear is the
conclusion of the body cam footage and stuff, but
you'll understand, the evidence will show, that
he's sort of removed because he is the officer
that is involved in the shooting pursuant to
protocol, just as with the outside agency
investigating this matter. There's certain
protocol that is followed when there's an
officer-involved shooting.

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.3

2.4

A couple days later -- well, the evidence is going to show that the body cam footage from Officer Malafa and Officer Heaggan-Brown is taken pursuant to these protocols, and the evidence will be that a few days later, Mr. Heaggan-Brown, without having seen his body cam video, without having seen Officer Malafa's body cam video, voluntarily provides a statement to the investigators.

And in that statement you will see, when you are advised of the statement with respect to the video, that he describes really in great detail and confirms what it is that you are going to see on that video. And in that statement he does say that he was concerned, that he feared for

his safety, that Mr. Smith, Sylville Smith was reaching for a weapon, and he feared for his safety and the safety of Officer Malafa.

2.0

2.3

You are also going to hear testimony from a gentleman by the name of Robert Willis.

Mr. Willis is a former law enforcement officer himself. He's also had a career in training current and future police officers in amongst, you know, many things; defense and arrest tactics, use of deadly force. He's trained them all over the State of Wisconsin, and, in fact, has authored a training manual, one of the authors of a training manual that is employed by the various departments throughout the State of Wisconsin in order to instruct individuals, future police officers on these matters.

And Mr. Willis is going to provide testimony about weapons, the law in terms of police interaction with individuals, the training that police officers receive. He has seen the body camera footage, and, in fact, he has broken it down essentially frame by frame into what is about 131, 130 -- 132 of a second. He's going to discuss the police training regarding the use of force, including deadly force, and when and under

what circumstances it can be used.

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

Mr. Willis will further talk about what he terms — the nature of what he terms "a gun fight," more specifically, when is gun fight begins and when it is that it ends. He will tell you that police officers are trained with what's called the plus—one rule. They are trained that where a suspect has one weapon they should believe that there is another weapon present. The weapon they see, plus one additional weapon. And he will tell you that gun fight ends when the threat has been stopped. And a threat isn't just a weapon that is seen, but a number of facts and circumstances concerning the entire situation and the suspect's behavior.

You have promised to listen to all of the evidence, and I, again, ask you and remind you to do so. You should do that, that is your job.

But about that video, I mentioned that it's been broken down sort of frame by frame, both by

Mr. Willis and certainly by the prosecution here.

Those frames can be paused and stopped on any particular frame, but that isn't how these events unfold. We are looking at them and you will be looking at them in hindsight, but they unfolded in

1 real time.

2.0

The whole chase from the time

Mr. Heaggan-Brown gets out of his vehicle to the

time of the second shot being fired, that whole

chase, that whole sequence, 12 seconds or less.

And the time between that first shot and second

shot, 1.69, 1.7 seconds. That's the real time in

which this unfolded.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is what we believe the evidence is going to show in this matter. The evidence is going to show that Mr. Heaggan-Brown was doing his job on August the 13th, 2016, and that when he fired two shots at Sylville Smith, that he did so fearing for his safety and fearing for the safety of Officer Malafa. And based upon that and upon and under the law, we believe Mr. Heaggan-Brown is not guilty of this offense, and that is the verdict at the end of this case that we will ask you to return. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

All right. We are going to break for the evening. You have your schedules, and the deputies who are going to be with you will be giving you your schedules and taking care of you this evening and into tomorrow morning. We will resume tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. with the beginning of the evidence and work through the evidence all day tomorrow and then through the rest of the week.

I don't have to remind you what not to do, I've already told you. Plus, the officers and the deputies that will be with you will be reminding you as to what you can and cannot do. Enjoy your evening, and we'll see everyone tomorrow morning at 9 a.m.

THE BAILIFF: All rise for the jury.

(The jury left the courtroom.)

THE BAILIFF: You may be seated.

THE COURT: All right. We have a handful of housekeeping matters to take care of so why don't we do that right now so that we don't forget. So let's start with the strikes for cause that we had decided in chambers, and it was — it's my understanding that all of the strikes for cause that we — that the Court granted were stipulated to. I'm not going to go through the

1	strikes for cause through the entire list; it will
2	only be Jurors 1 through 39 that were in the
3	selection process. So that would be Jurors No. 8,
4	10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 32, 35, 37.
5	Is that correct?
6	MR. LINDSAY: Yes, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Smith?
8	MR. SMITH: It is.
9	THE COURT: All right. Also, we lost a
10	juror. We're not going to discuss all the
11	specifics right now, but suffice it to say that
12	Juror No. 36 is no longer going to be with us as
13	far as this trial is concerned. The Court will
14	take the issues on that up later on. It was the
15	decision both of the Court, as well as the
16	attorneys, that we were to continue on without
17	that juror.
18	Is that correct, Mr. Lindsay or
19	Mr. Chisholm, whoever wants to speak?
20	MR. LINDSAY: Yes, Your Honor, that's
21	correct.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Smith?
23	MR. SMITH: It is.
24	THE COURT: All right. And the Court
25	will take that up either later this week or next

2.3

2.4

week sometime when we have the time to actually deal with it. Is there any other record we need to make?

MR. LINDSAY: There was a defense motion in chambers.

THE COURT: Oh, that's correct. Do you want to put that on the record briefly?

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, during the close of my voir dire, and it was sort of the discussion previously about what I would call the catchall question — I'm sorry, Madam Reporter.

Can I have the microphone? Sort of a catchall question about is there anything that anyone believed that they should volunteer, actually, I think it was in response to a question of any answer somebody would change is really what I think it was. At that time Juror No. 18 had indicated that in his questionnaire he filled out one answer but subsequent to that point in time he came to realize that he was aware of other cases involving Mr. Heaggan-Brown.

We at the time stopped the questioning of No. 18. We had a discussion in chambers. At that time we moved or had Your Honor make a determination about whether this panel should be

dismissed and a new panel employed given the potential taint that could have or may have occurred by the statement by Juror No. 18. That was made in chambers and the Court denied that request.

THE COURT: Correct. And just let me expand on the record a little bit. Is that -- first of all, is that the understanding of the State?

MR. LINDSAY: That's correct. I think the specific statement by the juror was that he became aware of other cases in which Mr. Heaggan-Brown was involved.

THE COURT: Well, I don't even know if he went that far. He said other cases and I think it got cut off pretty close to that.

In any event, I know what the -- the intent and what he meant by that. It got cut off pretty quickly. The concern, you know, the Court had obviously was that this issue was to not be considered by the jury or the jury panel and we tried very hard to keep that from being known to the panel, and if it was, then we tried to root it out. I think it happened in such a quick fashion and the way it was worded in terms of cases was

somewhat middle of the road the way it was explained. Cases could mean cases of which he may be a defendant or cases in which he was involved as an officer, any number of things. And it kind of went so quickly that I don't think anyone really picked up on it, or if they did, they really didn't think twice about it.

2.0

2.3

The other thing that we have going for us with regard to this panel here is that this jury panel, in my estimation over the 3 to 400 juries that I've had over the years, is a very good jury and a jury that would put things aside if instructed to do so and make a decision based only on the evidence. I can't guarantee that, but the feeling that the Court had was since this appeared to me to be somewhat de minimis, we could toss out the entire panel and start all over again but that wasn't going to guarantee that somebody else wasn't going to blurt something worse out, ended up we would never get a panel selected in this case.

So the long and the short of this is the Court believed that this issue was de minimis, it was not anything that would be prejudicial to the defendant -- or overly prejudicial to the

defendant and the Court denied the motion.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

MR. LINDSAY: Judge, the only other thing I would note, because I think the record would be silent, is that at the time that the question was asked, that juror had already been stipulated as a strike for cause based on the hardship question.

THE COURT: Correct. He was no long —
he was not going to be an active, participating
juror anyways. The concern, obviously, was more
that it was spoken out in front of the other
jurors. But as I said, it was something that went
so quickly and it was shut down so quickly and he
was not allowed to expand on that that it was
something in my mind that was de minimis and
therefore did not require the drastic remedy that
was requested.

Anything else?

MR. LINDSAY: No.

MR. SMITH: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Let me talk to the lawyers about scheduling for tomorrow for a few minutes, and then I need to talk to the deputies about tomorrow, and we do need to swear the afternoon deputies, the second shift deputies.

1	So that will be just the two of you?
2	THE BAILIFF: Three.
3	THE COURT: We have another one out
4	here?
5	THE BAILIFF: Yeah, there's three
6	deputies. They're right inside.
7	THE COURT: In addition to these guys
8	or separate? The second shift guys are out there?
9	THE BAILIFF: Yes.
10	THE COURT: Got it. You should go get
11	them. All right. There we go.
12	THE CLERK: I'm going to swear you guys
13	in.
14	(The bailiffs were sworn in.)
15	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.
16	MR. KOHN: We are done with our client?
17	THE COURT: Yes, we are finished with
18	that today.
19	Let me start with the sheriff's
20	department since they need to make their
21	arrangements, and then we can talk very briefly
22	about tomorrow and then I think we're done for the
23	evening.
24	(Proceedings adjourned at 4:48 p.m.)
25	

1	STATE OF WISCONSIN )
2	) ss.
3	MILWAUKEE COUNTY )
4	
5	
6	I, LAURELL L. BRESLOW-COLLIEN,
7	Official Court Reporter in and for the Circuit Court of
8	Milwaukee County, do hereby certify that the foregoing
9	is a true and correct transcript of all the proceedings
10	had in the above-entitled matter as the same are
11	contained in my original machine shorthand notes on the
12	said trial or proceedings.
13	
14	Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin on January 12, 2018.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Electronically signed by:
21	LAURELL L. BRESLOW-COLLIEN, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
22	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
23	
24	
25	